



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

phratric and moiety systems, appearing sporadically in many parts of North America, may have had a common remote origin or a single center of diffusion" (*American Anthropologist*, vol. 19, 1917, p. 405). In situations such as this a wider comparative outlook will often prove of value. If phratries in the form of dual divisions associated with clans or gentes were an exceptional phenomenon, restricted in its distribution, say, to North America, this would constitute a *prima facie* justification of an attempt to correlate historically the several moiety systems of that continent. But such is far from being the case. Moieties in association with clans are all but universal in Australia and very common in Melanesia; hence one is not surprised to encounter them in some of the clan (or gentile) areas of North America, and a check is put on overzealous attempts to apply the principle of diffusion.

I must confess to a sense of keen disappointment that an American student of the thoroughness and critical acumen of Mr. Barbeau should have shown in a field with which his familiarity cannot be doubted so little grasp of the fundamental methodological principles involved in problems of diffusion and independent development.

A. A. GOLDENWEISER

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,  
NEW YORK CITY

#### THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FIVE NATIONS: A REPLY

STUDENTS of Iroquoian social and political organization and folklore are fortunate in having so able a source of data as Mr. J. N. B. Hewitt. In the *Anthropologist*, vol. 19, no. 3, Mr. Hewitt criticized one of my recent publications, *The Constitution of the Five Nations*, and most ably pointed out both the faults of the native authorities who supplied my information and the errors in editing. In an earlier issue of the *Anthropologist* Dr. A. A. Goldenweiser published a criticism. In justice to the subject it would have been well and saved a possible misunderstanding if both critics had read page 12 and 13 of the introduction. There I said:

The two principal manuscripts that form the basis of this work were found on the Six Nations Reservation, Ontario, Canada, in 1910.

The first manuscript was a lengthy account of the Dekanawida legend and an account of the Confederate Iroquois laws. This material has been brought together by Seth Newhouse, a Mohawk who has expended a large amount of time and given the subject a lengthy study. His account written in Indian English was submitted to Albert Cusick, a New York Tuscarora-Onondaga, for review and criticism. Mr. Cusick had long been an authority on Iroquois law

and civic rites, and had been a chief informant for Horatio Hale, William Beauchamp, and in several instances for the present writer. Mr. Cusick was employed for more than a month in correcting the Newhouse manuscript until he believed the form in which it is now presented fairly correct and at least as accurate as a free translation could be made. The second manuscript was compiled by the chiefs of the Six Nations Council and in the form here published has been reviewed and corrected by several of their own number including Chiefs John Gibson, Jacob Johnson and John William Elliott. The official copy was made by Hilton Hill, a Seneca, then employed by the Dominion Superintendent for the Six Nations. It has been reviewed and changes were suggested by Albert Cusick. . . .

In presenting these documents the original orthography has been retained. The only attempt to record Iroquois names and words phonetically is in the notes. This will account for some variations in spelling. . . .

In the light of the conditions under which the Bulletin under discussion was presented, a compilation of native documents, criticism seems gratuitous. Especially significant is Mr. Hewitt's attempt to controvert my statement of Mr. Cusick's help. One would almost suspect this to be designed to impute a falsehood, but in the light of Mr. Cusick's assistance, this imputation would seem to fall little short of maliciousness though probably not so intended.

The reference to "a free translation" should be apparent to anyone who has read the work under discussion. Suffice to say, no translation or presentation in English can gracefully and fluently express the Iroquoian idiom. Witness Mr. Hewitt's own literal translation of the "Iroquois Cosmology." It appears in clumsy, stilted English, involved and lacking in force of expression. Literal translation robs the native thought of much of its meaning and emphasis.

Our critic's reference to wampum would seem to imply that only one sort of wampum was recognized by us, though the manuscripts clearly name elderberry twigs, scouring rushes and porcupine quills. The wampum belts described as "constitution belts" may be regarded as such even though not made during the days of Dekanawida, in this sense being as truly memorials to the founding of the League as Lincoln's Gettysburg speech is Lincoln's still even though printed in today's newspaper. The belts are old and probably native made and they have been invested with the symbolism ascribed to them—memorials of the days when Dekanawida spoke.

The lack of accuracy, consistency and forethought on the part of the authors of the manuscripts is to be deplored but even though these Indian annalists wrote clumsily it did not occur to me that of my own

initiative I should alter their writings, even for the sake of presenting them as I personally desired to see them. Mr. Hewitt must learn that if ethnologists should habitually change the myths and native manuscripts that came into their hands, in order to bring about consistency, the finished production would shrink in value. The scientist takes what comes to him from the quarry, and though it is covered by corrosion and foreign matter, he presents it as found. It is his specimen upon which he does not chisel an inscription. That is written on a separate label.

An example of native inaccuracy is quoted by Mr. Hewitt in the following: "After a journey across the lake (Ontario) he came into the hunting territory of the Flint Nation." Mr. Hewitt correctly stated that the immediate landing place of Dekanawidah would be in Oneida territory. Our Indian writer simply described things rapidly and without detailed chronological sequence, yet if some other writer had penned a line such as "After a journey across the ocean Olaf Jensen came into the forests of Minnesota," we think few critics would have deliberately gone out of their way to say that the assertion implied that Minnesota was on the Atlantic coast, especially if the statement had been made to those familiar with geography.

We accept in a proper spirit the catalogue of our own blunders but we must insist that we do not believe that in presenting the Indian manuscripts, we should eliminate their "crudity and naïvete from consideration," even to satisfy those who possess other versions of these Iroquois codes and legends. Indians who were life-long residents of their respective reservations produced the documents and stood for them. The writings represent in English, so far as they were able to make them, what they thought, believed, and lived in Iroquois. They do not necessarily represent what the present writer thinks accurate in detail or satisfactory.

Mr. Hewitt has had a large influence in directing the minds of his informants and no doubt, as he himself suggests, has contributed largely to their store of ancient lore, though we must confess it seems to us that "facts" so collected seem like re-importations; in other words, like telling one's informants what to say and how to say it. For example, Mr. Hewitt tells in his criticism how he instructed Mr. Newhouse in a certain translation of Lafitau, and says that Newhouse accepted the data and incorporated it in his code, Section 93-96. Mr. Hewitt also tells how he instructed the chiefs in the translation of certain names. It is thus evident that my distinguished critic has had an enormous advantage in previously instructing for a period of years his native informants.

They have accepted his statements as correct and incorporated them in their writings as original with them. The extent of this may be realized when it is said that some of the chiefs admitted that Mr. Hewitt wrote the introduction to the chief's version.

In our translation of the "record" staff, a cut of which was published, we simply followed the translation made by Abram Charles, a chief of the Cayugas, for Mrs. H. M. Converse, at least twenty years ago. Mr. Cusick apparently was satisfied with the translation. However, we suspected that it might be an attempt to call to mind the so-called condolence ceremony and thus we placed the picture to face that text, and with considerable difficulty, but Mr. Hewitt evidently thinks it a coincidence.

We are grateful to Mr. Hewitt's criticism, for he has pointed out a store of facts that should have been made available years ago. Modestly he refrains from more extensive criticism, but we hope to have all the necessary data when he publishes his own version of "The Constitution of the League" for which he has prepared native texts in Mohawk and Onondaga. An English parallel in Mr. Hewitt's own fluent English will then be available and, of course, be above criticism, though there will be some who will suspect that the content and the "original text" have been rigidly supervised.

Apparently Mr. Hewitt agrees with Dr. Goldenweiser's earlier criticism, and yet Dr. Goldenweiser specifically states that "The Constitution of the Five Nations is a figment. . . . It does not exist . . . either written or unwritten." Strangely, however, it appears as a coincident that Mr. Hewitt's texts and translations parallel those we have published, for the *Twenty-eighth Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* mentions his collection of "texts" in the Onondaga and Mohawk dialects,

embodying the basic principles of the civil and political structures and organization of the League of the Iroquois and data relating thereto. The following captions will indicate sufficiently the subject matter of these texts: The Constitution of the League, the Powers of Thadodaho, Amendments, Powers and Rights of Chiefs, Powers and Rights of Women, Powers of the Women Chiefs, etc.

We confess that we do not quite understand Mr. Hewitt's concluding statement,

I have purposely not given out this unfavorable estimate of Mr. Parker's recent work until it had been reviewed by one whose motives Mr. Parker might not question.

The pure love of accuracy is sufficient motive, and should have prevented

any feeling of restraint in giving out "this unfavorable estimate," until some other ethnologist has taken the initiative. We trust that this inertia of Mr. Hewitt will now be overcome and that we may be prevented from getting into further sloughs of error by his speedy publication of his own version of the "Constitution of the Five Nations." We feel sure that the faults of our own attempt will but add to the luster of the greater work that is to come.

Like Kipling's hero in *The Neolithic Age*, I feel, as I survey the bulky criticism of my bulletin, as if ". . . a rival of Solutré told the tribe my style was *outré*. . . ." But I am consoled, as every ethnologist must be who finds dozens of versions of myths and "constitutions," in the last verse of the poem, and for a pleasant thought, I present it to my critics.

Here is wisdom for your use, as I learned it when the moose

And reindeer roared where Paris roars tonight

There are nine and sixty ways of constructing tribal lays,

And—every—single—one—of—them—is—right.

ARTHUR C. PARKER

NEW YORK STATE MUSEUM,

ALBANY, NEW YORK

#### CULTURE CONTACT AND MIGRATION *versus* INDEPENDENT ORIGIN: A PLEA FOR MORE LIGHT

IN his review in this journal<sup>1</sup> of a volume on Oceanic mythology of which I am guilty, and more especially in a more recent discussion of it published elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> Dr. Lowie has taken a stand on the question of culture contact and migration *versus* independent origin that seems to call for a few words of explanation on his part. The matter at issue is one of such general importance and interest, and Dr. Lowie's most recent statements are so puzzling, that it would seem in order for him to bear witness somewhat more fully, to the faith that is in him.

Somewhat hesitatingly in this journal, but with complete assurance in his latest review, Dr. Lowie declares that explanations of cultural similarities and differences as due in any measure to migrations (or even culture contact!) are woefully out of date—he suggests indeed, that no sane person nowadays even condescends to consider such a discarded and worn out hypothesis, which is after all but a "curious disease" which has infected ethnological thinking during the last decade. For those who will persist in such puerile explanations, it is clear that Dr.

<sup>1</sup> *American Anthropologist* (N. S.), vol. 19, pp. 86-88.

<sup>2</sup> *The New Republic*, vol. XIII, no. 166 (Jan. 5, 1918), pp. 288-289.